



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SP

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,780	12/16/2003	Clinton Jackson SR.	CJ-HR-1	4037
7590 01/18/2005			EXAMINER	
Henry W. Cummings 3313 W. Adams St. St. Charles, MO 63301			WILSON, LEE D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3723	

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/735,780

Applicant(s)

JACKSON ET AL.

Examiner

LEE D WILSON

Art Unit

3723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17 and 20-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6, 17 and 21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 7-15, 20 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Martin et al (5722641).

Martin et al discloses an automobile pneumatic jack assembly having cylinders (fig.2&20), at least one compressor (90), at least one distribution manifold (72), electronic controls (figs 5&6 and 80 has a hold fast position which is equivalent to locking-)

3. Claims 11- 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated Schneider et al (5176391).

Schneider et al discloses the claimed invention in particular an electrical interlock switch (230 and col.1 1 , lines 66-67 and col.2, lines 1-3).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 13 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider et al (5176391).

- a. Schneider et al (5176391) is discussed above.
- b. Schneider et al discloses the claimed invention except for a key. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have use a key switch instead of a button switch, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416. (Therefore, the key switch is like the equivalent of a button or switch can be used to turn the jack on and off to prevent accidental activation).

6. Claims 14-15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider et al (5176391) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Martin et al (5722641).

- c. Schneider et al are discussed above.
- d. Schneider et al does not disclose three position rocker switches.
- e. Martin et al discloses an invention having a jacking system using three position rocker switches which allow the jack to having three positions.
- f. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to have modified the Schneider device by replacing the activation switches with three position rocker switches as taught by martin et al which allow the jack to having three positions.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 2-6, 17 and 21 are allowed.

***Response to Arguments***

8. **Applicant's arguments filed 8/5/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.**

9. **Applicant feels that the rejections are not valid.**

g. Martin does disclose a pneumatic system. It does not matter if the applicant feels there system is better because patentability is based on the differences in the limitation and not personal opinion of which invention is assumed to be better.

10. **Applicant request reconsideration of Schneider.**

h. The Schneider reference discloses a system which has an interlock system wherein when the parking brake is applied is activated See (230 and col.1 1 , lines 66-67 and col.2, lines 1-3).

***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Chiang discloses an invention.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEE D WILSON whose telephone number is 571-272-4499. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOSEPH HAIL can be reached on 571-272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ldw

January 11, 2005

  
**LEE D. WILSON**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**